

Lake County Schools

Altoona School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Altoona School

42630 STATE ROAD 19, Altoona, FL 32702

<http://altoonaschool.org>

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Cerney

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Altoona School

42630 STATE ROAD 19, Altoona, FL 32702

<http://altoonaschool.org>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>94%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>17%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Altoona School mission is to provide a high-quality, comprehensive, and meaningful education for all students. Each student will be expected to succeed within the bounds of their abilities and the school's educational goals. Each student will be treated individually, given the tools to be a lifelong learner, and be taught to function as a member of a group and as a productive member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Altoona School to help students master academic skills, to educate them to the greatest extent possible so that they become active learners, and to teach them to be responsible citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Schmidt, Walter	Principal	Administration of the school, educationally and financially.
Cerney, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Administration of the school, educationally and financially.
Nelson, Beth	SAC Member	Governance board member.
Lovoy, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Lead teacher.
Tabb, Nikki	Teacher, ESE	ESE School Specialist
Donohue, Jennie	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Dawn Cerney

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

16

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	53	53	51	42	46	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	282
Attendance below 90 percent	11	7	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	3	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	1	2	2	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/11/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	70	49	47	51	40	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308
Attendance below 90 percent	12	6	6	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	3	3	11	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	6	4	8	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	70	49	47	51	40	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	308
Attendance below 90 percent	12	6	6	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	3	3	11	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	23	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	6	4	8	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	58%	57%	51%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	57%	58%	38%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	49%	53%	35%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	45%	60%	63%	52%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	56%	62%	51%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	21%	39%	51%	40%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	54%	53%	46%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	60%	3%	58%	5%
	2018	66%	61%	5%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	60%	-7%	58%	-5%
	2018	55%	59%	-4%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	51%	59%	-8%	56%	-5%
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
	2018	59%	65%	-6%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	61%	-13%	64%	-16%
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
	2018	42%	58%	-16%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	56%	-12%	53%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	31%	54%	-23%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	32	36	24	35	8	15				
HSP	60			50							
WHT	55	46	50	44	54	24	45				
FRL	46	40	41	34	47	18	34				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	35	43	26	32	25	8				
WHT	55	51	53	55	49	39	29				
FRL	52	50	53	52	52	39	33				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	32	32	38	25	36	31					
HSP	23	10		31	30						
WHT	56	42	39	54	53	37	48				
FRL	45	42	40	43	47	40	35				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	314
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science achievement showed the lowest performance at 43%. Science achievement scores have been consistently lower than the state and district averages over the past 3 years. The 2019 Science achievement score is a 12% gain from the previous year. One contributing factor that led to the increase in Science achievement was implementing more rigorous science instruction in all grades. Other contributing factors included implementing and participating in our school Science Fair and holding a Science Night event for families.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Math Achievement was Altoona School's second lowest area at 45%. This area showed the largest decline of 9% from the previous year. After analyzing the data, this is not a trend and we don't anticipate to repeat or continue. One of the contributing factors for the low math achievement last year was due to the severity of the learning disabilities in math for a large portion of our Students With Disabilities. Our lowest achieving students in math were the 3rd graders of the 2019 school year. This particular grade level has a trend of being an overall lower achieving grade level since the time they were in Kindergarten. With continued interventions, they are closing the learning gaps every year. Another factor was that we tested a relatively small student population. With one grade level having a significant amount of Students With Disabilities who were struggling in math, the percentages of math achievement were impacted negatively.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Math Achievement and Math Lowest 25th Percentile had the greatest gaps compared to the state average. We have had a gap between our math scores and the state average, but not to the extent that it was this past year. Math Achievement gap was 18% between the school and the state average. Math Lowest 25th Percentile was 30% lower than the state average. (See above for contributing factors)

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Science achievement showed the greatest gain this year with an increase from 31% to 43%, which is a 12% gain. We implemented a daily science focus in 4th and 5th grade, along with additional STEM activities. Additionally, the classroom teachers implemented a more rigorous science program in all grade levels.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Based on data from 2018-2019 school year, course failure in ELA or Math and Level 1 on statewide assessments are our areas of concern.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase Math Achievement and Math Lowest 25th Percentile
2. increase overall Science Achievement
3. Increase ELA Learning Gains
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers will intentionally plan and focus on student learning by providing rigorous and relevant tasks aligned to grade level standards. In addition to topic assessments, students will complete a standards aligned task to demonstrate their understanding of the topic. If we monitor and support student learning of standards and provide common planning for task analysis then teachers will intentionally plan and provide lessons aligned to the standards. Teachers will understand and utilize modeling, guided instruction, collaborative and independent learning with high expectations for all students. This area of focus supports our goal on increasing achievement in math.

Measurable Outcome: Increase student achievement in Math from 45% to 55% over the next 5 years. Increase Math learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile from 21% to 36% over the next 5 years.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennie Donohue (donohuej@altoonaschool.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Create a common planning schedule for all grade levels to intentionally plan with support from leadership including academic coach and administrators. Common planning and collaborative planning days will have clearly defined protocols, planning time frame and expected outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By creating common planning times, teachers will be able to collaboratively plan and create grade level assignments, solid instruction and high expectations. Students will have daily opportunities to demonstrate their understanding of standards through assignments, assessments or task related activities. Teachers will use a variety of strategies including modeling, guided instruction, collaborative and independent learning. This will be evident through student data and classroom walk throughs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Introduce Task Analysis protocol
2. Professional Development for Task Analysis
3. Create common planning schedule
4. Conduct weekly classroom walk throughs
5. Intervention Team push in and support teachers and students across the grade levels and curriculum
6. Through the use of Title I funds we will employ an additional 3rd grade teacher to allow for smaller class size increasing student performance.
7. Through the use of Title I funds we will purchase Reading and Math software (iReady and Raz Kids) to provide additional practice and resources for academic growth.
8. Through the use of Title I funds we will purchase supplemental instructional materials for Math and ELA to assist with student instruction.
9. Through the use of Title I funds we will employ a part-time Reading/Math Coach to support teachers and classroom instruction.

Person Responsible: Walter Schmidt (schmidtw@altoonaschool.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus With expectations set high, we will create a culture that promotes a safe and equitable learning environment for all students.
Description and Rationale: Through instruction and implementation of the Sanford Harmony Social-Emotional Learning Program and through monitoring attendance we will foster a safe and equitable learning environment for all students with a focus on regular school attendance.

Measurable Outcome: Maintain positive student behaviors through classroom standard operating procedures and continued trust in law enforcement through positive interaction with the school guardian. We will increase individual recognition for positive attendance to help reduce the number of students meeting the EWS indicator for attendance below 90%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dawn Cerney (cerneydawn@altoonaschool.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will utilize the Sanford Harmony Social Emotional Learning Program which includes a variety of problem-solving skills and implement an attendance mentoring program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Sanford Harmony Social Emotional Learning Program teaches students to build healthy relationships, work through disagreements and embrace diversity that can last into adulthood. We will continue to identify positive behavior and attendance expectations and provide incentives when expectations are met. Support will be in place including mentoring and counseling (ie school guardian, on site counselors, Mental Health Liaison).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize lesson plans for Sanford Harmony Social Emotional Learning Program
2. Identify students and create a schedule for monthly mentoring program
3. Meet regularly to disaggregate and measure the impact of utilized resources
4. Through the use of Title I funds we will employ a part-time Family School Liaison to build relationships with families and support for student learning.

Person Responsible Walter Schmidt (schmidtw@altoonaschool.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Teachers will understand, plan and use intervention and enrichment activities to meet the needs of all students in all content areas.

If we monitor and support intervention and enrichment strategies, then we will meet the needs of all students across each content area. Based on FSA scores, this area of focus was identified as a need to increase overall achievement in the areas of ELA, math and science. This will have an impact on student learning and success by meeting the needs of students through differentiation and strategic intervention and enrichment.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase overall achievement in ELA, math and science for all students, including those in the lower quartile as evidenced on the FSA; increase support for both teachers and students as evidenced by increases in student data and classroom walk throughs; increase the number of level 3's and 4's on FSA by continued use of effective strategies and support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennie Donohue (donohuej@altoonaschool.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will create and establish a schedule for the intervention team to push-in to classrooms to assist teachers and students in all grade levels. Create and establish intervention times in the master schedule for all students in all grades.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By having specific time scheduled throughout the day for intervention and enrichment, students and teachers will get additional support in all grade levels. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs to measure the impact of the intervention/enrichment time. The intervention team will meet to discuss data and summative/formative student assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hire qualified personnel for the intervention team
2. Through the use of Title I funds we will employ a Resource teacher for grades 3-5 to deliver targeted instruction in small groups.
3. Create intervention/enrichment time in the master schedule
4. Conduct weekly classroom walk throughs
5. Meet regularly to disaggregate data and identify students in need

Person Responsible

Walter Schmidt (schmidtw@altoonaschool.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will continue to work together as a school to increase overall school improvement. We will continue to look for areas that need attention and focus on developing effective strategies and actions to meet those needs. We will welcome feedback and input from all stakeholders and we will strive to communicate effectively and efficiently.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Parent and community involvement is vital to Altoona School. These two groups serve as important school stakeholders. Some of our community partners include: Umatilla Kiwanis Club, First Baptist Church of Umatilla, United Methodist Church of Altoona, First Baptist Altoona, Astor Kiwanis, Altoona Trail Riders, United Southern Bank, Sunsational Citrus, and TheCross Mount Dora. Many of these organizations give supplies, donations to our clothes closet, financial support, and serve as volunteers for special events held at school.

We have a Parent Resource Center on campus with resources and instructional materials parents can check out to practice math and reading at home with our students.

In our efforts to give back to the community we have several community service projects planned. Some of these projects include: canned food drive for local food banks, letters to our military personnel, winter coat drive for the homeless, hygiene drive for the homeless, and community clean up days.

Our main building is available for community members to use at no charge to host meeting or special events. Many local organizations use the building on a regular basis to accommodate their meeting needs.

Umatilla Kiwanis Club sponsors our school chapter of K-Kids. This program teaches students the importance of school and community involvement. We also have a very active Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) which meets monthly to plan, organize and host events for families. PTO helps build relationships between school and families.

Although we have a small ELL population, we strive to eliminate as many barriers as possible. All notices are sent home in the student's native language as indicated on the Home Language Survey. When necessary, a translator is made available for phone calls, messages and meetings. All students identified as ELL are provided additional resources such as (but not limited to) access to Rosetta Stone, Word to Word Dictionaries and Academic Glossaries. All materials are inventoried and monitored by our ELL Coordinator.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00